



BMJ Open is committed to open peer review. As part of this commitment we make the peer review history of every article we publish publicly available.

When an article is published we post the peer reviewers' comments and the authors' responses online. We also post the versions of the paper that were used during peer review. These are the versions that the peer review comments apply to.

The versions of the paper that follow are the versions that were submitted during the peer review process. They are not the versions of record or the final published versions. They should not be cited or distributed as the published version of this manuscript.

BMJ Open is an open access journal and the full, final, typeset and author-corrected version of record of the manuscript is available on our site with no access controls, subscription charges or pay-per-view fees (<http://bmjopen.bmj.com>).

If you have any questions on BMJ Open's open peer review process please email info.bmjopen@bmj.com

BMJ Open

TACKLING THE WORKFORCE CRISIS IN DISTRICT NURSING – CAN THE DUTCH BUURTZORG MODEL OFFER A SOLUTION AND A BETTER PATIENT EXPERIENCE? A MIXED METHODS CASE STUDY

Journal:	<i>BMJ Open</i>
Manuscript ID	bmjopen-2018-021931
Article Type:	Research
Date Submitted by the Author:	31-Jan-2018
Complete List of Authors:	Drennan, Vari; Kingston University Faculty of Health Social Care and Education, Centre for Health & Social Care Research Calestani, Melania; Kingston University Faculty of Health Social Care and Education, Centre for Health & Social Care Research Ross CBE, Fiona; Kingston University and St. George's, University of London, Faculty of Health, Social Care and Education Saunders, Mary; Quest QUEST Community Health Care Consultancy, London, UK. West , Peter; Independent health economist
Keywords:	Organisation of health services < HEALTH SERVICES ADMINISTRATION & MANAGEMENT, Human resource management < HEALTH SERVICES ADMINISTRATION & MANAGEMENT, Quality in health care < HEALTH SERVICES ADMINISTRATION & MANAGEMENT, PRIMARY CARE

SCHOLARONE™
Manuscripts

**TACKLING THE WORKFORCE CRISIS IN DISTRICT NURSING – CAN THE
DUTCH BUURTZORG MODEL OFFER A SOLUTION AND A BETTER
PATIENT EXPERIENCE? A MIXED METHODS CASE STUDY**

Vari M Drennan, Centre for Health & Social Care Research, Joint Faculty of Kingston University & St. George’s University of London. London, UK. *

Melania Calestani, Centre for Health & Social Care Research , Joint Faculty of Kingston University & St. George’s University of London. London, UK.

Fiona Ross, Centre for Health and Social Care Research, Joint Faculty of Kingston University and St George’s, University of London, London, UK

Mary Saunders, QUEST Community Health Care Consultancy, London, UK.

Peter West , Independent health economist, London ,UK .

Corresponding Author
VM Drennan
v.drennan@sgul.kingston.ac.uk
Faculty for Health, Social Care & Education, Kingston University & St. George’s University of London, Hunter Wing ,St. George’s University of London,
Cranmer Terrace,
London SW170RE
Telephone 0208 725 2339

Word count 3,850 - excluding title page, references, figures

Key words

Home health nursing; District nursing; Nursing organisation and administration; Health service research

ABSTRACT

Despite policy intentions for more health care out of hospital, district nursing services face multiple funding and staffing challenges which comprise the care delivered and policy objectives.

Objectives: What is the impact of the adapted Buurtzorg model on feasibility, acceptability and effective outcomes in an English district nursing service?

Design: Mixed methods case study,

Setting: Primary care,

Participants: Neighbourhood nursing team (Buurtzorg model), patients and carers, general practitioners, other health professionals, managers and conventional district nurses.

Results: The adapted Buurtzorg model of community nursing demonstrated feasibility and acceptability to patients, carers, GPs and other health professionals. For many patients it was preferable to previous experiences of district nursing in terms of continuity in care, improved support of multiple long term conditions (encompassing physical, mental and social factors), and proactive care. For the neighbourhood nurses the ability to make operational and clinical decisions at team level meant adopting practices which made the service more responsive, accessible, efficient, and offered a more attractive working environment. Challenges were reported by nurses and managers in relation to the recognition and support of the concept of self-managing teams within a large bureaucratic health care organisation. While there were some reports of clinical effectiveness and efficiency this was not possible to quantify, cost or compare with the standard district nursing service.

Conclusions: The adapted Buurtzorg model of neighbourhood nursing holds potential for addressing issues of concern to patients, carers and staff in the community. The two interacting innovations, i.e. a renewed focus on patient and carer-centred care and the self-managing team, were implemented in ways that patients, carers, other health professionals and nurses could identify difference for both the nursing care and also the nurses' working lives. It now requires longer term investigation to understand both the mechanism for change and also the sustainability.

Article Summary

Strengths and limitations of this study

1. Although a single site, the mixed methods (interviews, observation, analysis of patient records and internal reports and audits) provide multiple perspectives and add to the strength of the evidence.
2. The use of routinely collected patient level data was a limitation as it did not include measures of case-mix e.g. diagnosis, medical acuity or proximity to death or clinical outcomes.
3. We could not address questions of cost effectiveness for a number of reasons including that the new model was in the implementation stage and that as a complex intervention outcomes for district nursing are not clear cut.

;

BACKGROUND

Health care systems across the world are seeking to increase primary care services in order to address changing population health needs and contain rising health care costs. [1] In some countries this includes the provision of home visiting nurses who are named variously as home healthcare , visiting nurses, public health , community health and district nurses (as used in the United Kingdom, UK). Visiting nursing services serve mainly older adult patients with chronic conditions and disabilities who are housebound [2], although in some countries (see for example Ireland [3] and Japan [4]), they also provide maternal and child health services. The nursing care covers a spectrum of activities from education, teaching, technical care, physical and psychological support to case management which can address the management of acute illness, multiple long term conditions or palliative care. [2] Visiting nursing services therefore have the potential to help older people with chronic conditions remain in their own homes rather than be admitted to hospitals or care home facilities, which is a key element of the International Plan of Action on Ageing adopted by many nations. [5]

Visiting nurses are always a small group in any national nursing workforce (for example 7%, 9 and 13% in Australia, the UK and the United States respectively) [6, 7, 8] Attracting and retaining nurses in home visiting services is a recognised problem. [9, 10, 11] Many interacting factors affect nurse turnover but there is strong evidence that individual stress and autocratic managerial styles are influential in decisions to leave. [12] One model of visiting nursing services that it has been reported to both deliver high levels of patient satisfaction and also high staff satisfaction is that of the Dutch Buurtzorg organisation. [13] This social enterprise organisation uses a patient centred model of care combined with self-managing teams of visiting nurses. A review of the Dutch evidence and applicability to the United States reported “Buurtzorg has earned high patient and employee ratings and appears to provide high-quality home care at lower cost than other organizations” [8 p14]. The Buurtzorg model has attracted interest in many countries including the UK [15] where there are acknowledged problems in both meeting demand for these types of services and also in attracting and retaining nurses to work within them [16]. This paper reports on the evaluation of a pilot implementation of a Buurtzorg model of district nursing in a single, inner city site in the English National Health Service (NHS). This pilot within an NHS organisation in London was the first in the UK. [17] The NHS is a tax funded health care system, free at the point of delivery. The overarching research question was one of feasibility of such a model in district nursing in the English NHS setting. Supplementary research questions were concerned with the potential impact on nursing practice, patient and carer satisfaction and outcomes, about the organisational experience of implementation, as well as questions as to the types and availability of patient level data required to consider cost effectiveness.

METHODS

A mixed methods study was undertaken in a single case study. [18] This drew on the Donabedian framework for judging quality in health care i.e. criteria of acceptability, equity, effectiveness, appropriateness, and patient safety. [19]

The intervention of interest was the new team, known as the neighbourhood nursing (NN) team, who worked to the adapted Buurtzorg model. The first three members of the team, with the coach, were recruited and started visiting patients in November 2016. The coach role was one of facilitation in self-management. The team visited patients who were registered with one of three general practices and lived within a twenty minute walk of their office in a socio-economically deprived area of Inner London. The team recruited new members throughout the first six months until they numbered nine

at which point they spilt into two teams, one covering a new area. As a self-managing team they made all operational decisions in weekly meetings conducted using Buurtzorg principles, including voting. [20] Their employing NHS Trust had a district nursing service of around 200 nurses and health care assistant posts and at the time of the implementation a vacancy rate of 40%.

Methods of data collection (from January 2017 – July 2017) included: semi structured individual interviews , group interviews, observation of nursing practice and team meetings, analysis of internal documents and anonymised patient records. Potential participants were approached in the first instance by the NHS Trust and details of those willing to take part were passed to the study team. Interviews (face to face or by telephone as preferred) were conducted with patients and carers (n=14, by MC) as well as general practitioners (GPs), other health professionals and managers (n=10 by FR). Topic guides were used that addressed questions of individual experience of the NN team, views on the way in which the new model was working , any contrasts observed with the standard district nursing services (comparative group) and any impact for patients, carers, or wider services. Interviews were digitally recorded or notes taken as preferred then transcribed verbatim and anonymized. Group interviews, using adapted nominal group techniques (NGT), [21] were conducted with the NN team on a monthly basis by VMD. A single group interview was also conducted with a locality district nursing (DN) team. NGT captures data contemporaneously on flip charts. The charts were transcribed and any identifiers removed. Analysis of transcripts was facilitated by NVivo 10 software. All interview materials were thematically analysed, based on the data-driven inductive approach [22], in an iterative and reflective process by three researchers (MC, FR, VMD). Disagreements were resolved through discussion with the wider team and amended accordingly. Observation of NN and DN team nursing practice was undertaken by an experienced observer of DN practice (MS). Observations were conducted over eight days of entire shifts with four NN and four DN team staff. Observations were recorded contemporaneously using validated tools for judging complexity and quality of patient care. [23] Six NN team meetings were observed and field notes taken. Anonymised patients electronic records of the NN team and a comparable number from DN team patients were requested with data fields to allow comparison of nursing activity and outcomes for patients with similar levels of complexity. Unfortunately, for reasons outlined in the discussion section of this paper, these were not available. Anonymised records of 100 NN team patients were given to the research team with specific data fields: age gender, reason for referral, nursing activities, times of contacts and discharge (not free text clinical notes). These were entered onto an SPSS database and descriptive analysis only conducted. Internal documents and reports were analysed for data pertinent to the questions of interest. Reporting in this paper uses standards for reporting organisational case study research (see supplementary file 1).[24]

RESULTS

The multiple sources of data enable us to report findings from different perspectives: patients and carers; neighbourhood nurses (NN) and managers; other health professionals and from the observation of practice and patient records.

The patient and carer perspective

Patients and carers reported high levels of satisfaction with the NN team. “*The care the neighbourhood [nurses] giving is first class*” Patient 9. Patients commented on the willingness of the nurses to listen and address the needs of the patient.

“That's my kingpin [the nurse], because she's like you [the interviewer], she sits down and listens and she doesn't... you start a sentence, she let me finish like you do”. Patient 3

The proactive approach of the nurses of working on the problems the patients identified was positively commented on by many of those interviewed:

“They [the NN nurse] have come in and they have pushed the whole thing [the care required to support a patient with a stroke] into shape and knocked it into shape and got on with doing the things which we'd been waiting six or eight, 12 months for things to happen.... And they'll explain what they've done like ‘I've phoned your GP’.” Carer 10.

Eight patients had had previous experience with the district nursing service, *“I had them [district nurses] in the past and they were quite good as well”* Patient 5. However they were all able to point to negative experiences of the DN service resulting in poor clinical consequences. These were:

- A lack of continuity in nurses attending them and its impact on their care,
- Brief visits with a concomitant lack of attention to any problem beyond that the nurse had attended for,
- Lack of follow-up to initial visits or subsequent care,
- Difficulties in contacting the nurses.

All contrasted their NN team experience with that previous experience and described the difference now: continuity in the nurse which made addressing clinical issues more straightforward, attention paid to all their concerns and questions, follow up of visits and plans (with communication back as to what had been done or was going to happen) and direct contact details to the nurse (and NN team).

“And now we have the neighbourhood nurses ...the new system is so different, it's like cheese and chalk.” Patient 7

Other health care professionals' perspective

Positive care outcomes were reported by General Practitioners (GPs) as well as positive feedback they had received from patients and family

“They've been especially good for the end-of-life patients ...and I think the family have found that good support generally, as well.” GP 3

They described a period of learning to work together with the new team but noted some differences from the DN team in that the NN team came to them with patient problems and identified solutions rather than just problems. *“They do seem to be more proactive, I think, in care.”* GP 1. Specialist nurses reported positive patient clinical outcomes (for example improvement in long term condition management not previously achieved) which they attributed to the NN team way of working.

“They have made such a difference with some of the most difficult to engage people with mental health problems and other long term conditions”. Specialist nurse 3

Observing the care

Independent observation of the nursing practice confirmed that the NN team nursing practice was very different from the District Nurse (DN) team practices but it was also noted the NN team had a small patient caseload at that point in time in comparison to the DN team.

“It was clear to the observer that the NN team had a different approach to care. All nurses seemed to have a very personal relationship with their clients. They were often hugged and kissed by the client. Many clients gave unsolicited praise for their nurses citing how much

they appreciated the continuity of care and the relationship they had with the nurse. Many patients were telephoned before the visit and often a time for the visit was negotiated. For almost every patient, each NN team nurse asked if they could get them anything to eat or drink and were quite happy to do this for the patients on some occasions. During the visit the NN nurses placed much more focus on the total care of the patients than most of visits observed of the DN nurses. They also spent time offering health promotion and preventative advice. For the patients seen with the NN nurses the communication with the social carers seemed to be fuller and more inclusive than that observed with the DN team for example explaining how best to help the patient to mobilise more.” Observer report

Inefficiencies in recording of care and duplication between home visiting nursing services were observed in the DN team. In contrast the NN team had changed their practices to be as efficient as possible and ensure continuity in nurses, avoiding duplication with other services.

Recorded care

Records of 100 patients referred to the NN team over 6 months were examined (97 following removal of duplicates). 74 had been referred by GPs but reasons were not given. 80 of these patients received care from the NN team (reasons for not receiving care included admission to hospital or hospice). The majority were female and aged over 75 (table 1). Comparative patient characteristics are provided for the wider DN service for 12 months covering the same period.

	NN team (%)	District nursing service (%)
Female	50 (62.5)	12884 (60)
Male	30 (37.5)	8531 (40)
Age Groups		
<25	0	99(<1)
25-34	0	195 (1)
35-44	1 (1.4)	417(3)
45-54	5 (7.0)	1132 (5)
55-64	14 (19.7)	2052(10)
65-74	15 (21.1)	3389 (16)
75-84	22 (31.0)	6416 (30)
85-94	14 (19.7)	6782 (32)
95-106	0	945 (4)

Table 1 Characteristics of the patients of the NN team and the DN service

The patient records did not use any classification system for patients’ diagnosis, patient acuity or complexity of nursing activity. The NN team recorded 269 face to face appointments with patients and 2,267 telephone and follow up telephone consultations. In contrast, the DN teams rarely recorded using telephone consultations with patients (Table 2). Activities ranged from health promotion to palliative care. In contrast to the DN team, the NN team were providing personal care and meal preparation in the short term while Local Authority funded care packages were established (Table 2).

Activities	NN Team, of 2536 recorded contacts	DN Team , of 303,510 recorded contacts
Telephone and follow up telephone consultations	2,267	135
Meal preparation	62	57
Personal care given	77	120

Table 2 NN and DN team types of contact

The nurses' experience

The NN team staff described their experience in very positive terms *"I enjoy everyday – everyday is a pleasure"*. NN 1. They reported their satisfaction in their work came from positive patient feedback, from positive feedback from GPs and other health professionals and from working together collectively to provide the service.

"She [family carer] told me we had managed to do things for her [a relative] by [detail of nursing care and organising help from another service] that had really changed their lives and she felt so much better. That no one before we were involved had managed this". NN 3

The observed NN team meetings with their coach demonstrated the ways they worked as a team in making operational decisions. The NN team worked as just that – a team providing care for patients – which those who had worked in DN services were able to pinpoint the difference. They described their DN team experience had been that each staff member had their list of patients for the shift and the responsibility was theirs alone. There had been no sense of collectively problem solving or helping each other to complete the necessary work in that shift. The NN team also paid attention to their work-life balance, for example, they were observed in team meetings to agree time back in lieu for extra hours worked. Many of the working practices the NN team adopted addressed the issues that the DN nursing staff raised in the NGT interview as aspects they disliked about their jobs (Table 3).

Frustration about their job expressed by the district nursing staff	The NN team way of working that addressed the frustration
Lack of time to complete the work –	The NN team agreed flexibility in their working hours to meet the patient need and a caseload they could manage,
Multiple , changing nursing staff providing care –	The NN team had model of a named staff member to patient,
Lack of communication about patients and their whereabouts e.g. attending hospital appointment.	Patients had named NN nurse telephone number and that nurse communicated directly with patients to arrange time for appointment visit
Lack of ability/permission to innovate	The decision making with the NN team allowed new ideas to be tried,
Lack of flexibility in the staff rota agreed at senior levels six weeks ahead–	NN team rota agreed in weekly meetings between the nurses and changes made as long as the staffing required was available,
Lack of extra pay or time in lieu for extra hours worked –	The NN team agreed time in lieu given to individuals for extra hours worked at their weekly meetings.

Table 3 Frustrations of DN team members as addressed by the NN team

The NN team members also reported their experience was very challenging in learning to work as a self-managing team. Some nurses applied for NN team jobs and then declined job offers following interview and others took up posts and subsequently left. The NN team described having to *"unlearn"* dependent behaviour on managers and also having to *"learn"* how to make and accept decisions as a

team. This included learning how to manage differing opinions in a group and commit to the decisions of the team. It was evident in some observed team meetings that differences of opinion between team members were not always comfortable situations, that simple decision-making could be protracted and voting did not always resolve the situation. Some of the NN team questioned longer term issues about the nature of ‘flat’ structures with salaries fixed on their previous employment and as yet no clarity on career and financial progression.

Challenges were also reported in the extent the wider organisation recognised the concept of a self-managing team. *“I’m surprised after all these months that [managers in the wider organisation] are still trying to manage us, tell us what to do”*, NN 2. The NN team stressed how important a role the coach was in supporting them to be a self-managing team and also being a “buffer” between the team and the wider organisation. The NN team staff stressed that ‘back office’ support should be in place before a nursing team commenced. The lack of information technology systems to support mobile working (a current project in the wider organisation) was particularly irksome to the NN team especially when compared to that they had observed in the Dutch Buurtzorg service.

The managers’ perspective

There was strong commitment from the leaders and managers to testing and championing this model. At the same time there was curiosity and questioning as to the value and impact of an adapted Buurtzorg model. While the “team and delivery” was seen to be working well, all interviewees in different ways pointed out that *“the headaches are the organisation itself”*. Some interviewees reflected on the readiness of the wider management cadre and administrative and support departments to embrace the concept of self-managing teams. The coach role was viewed as critical as was back office business support. The impact on costs was reported to be too early to assess. The ways to measure impact on costs were being discussed by managers. There were interesting suggestions *“need to be nuanced in how to evaluate costs...not just about costs also productivity”*. An example was given to illustrate this point, *“If a patient has been on the caseload for years with a twice a day visit that has been reduced to once a week because now [they are] self-managing, that is so much better”*. Other aspects were also discussed such as the rate of processing patient referrals *“massive opportunity to save on paper and time from streamlined decision-making”*, patient hospital readmission rates, the number of serious incidents and patient complaints as well as the friends and family test.

DISCUSSION

This study found that an adapted Buurtzorg model in the English NHS was feasible and acceptable to patients, carers, GPs and other health professionals, as well as preferable for many patients to current delivery models. The ability to make operational and clinical decisions at team level meant adopting practices which made the service more responsive , accessible , efficient, and for some nurses, attractive to work in. Challenges were reported in relation to the recognition and support of the concept of self-managing teams within a large bureaucratic health care organisation. While there were some reports of clinical effectiveness and efficiency this was not possible to quantify, cost or compare with the usual delivery of district nursing service.

The strength of this study was the use of mixed methods which allowed the research questions to be addressed from multiple perspectives and types of data. The study was limited to a single site and by using routinely collected patient level data. This data did not include diagnosis or measures of casemix to categorise both complexity in the patient (e.g. through multiple conditions) and also medical acuity or proximity to death. It should be noted that most NHS organisations do not routinely collecting this type of data about district nursing patients. [16] The NHS use of block contracts for

funding district nursing, rather than fee or tariff payment by type of patient or type of activity does little to promote such classification. This means there is no direct cost per patient to the NHS, as there is for hospital care, and so no clear, standardised costs to set beside any outcomes data. The Dutch Buurtzorg organisation uses the Omaha system of patient classification and nursing activity. [25] The nature of community nursing care is relational and encompasses complex interventions, which are difficult to measure (compared to a single disease or single pill evaluation). Therefore the issue of cost effectiveness is not clear cut. Outcome measures are rarely quantified. Effectiveness of community nursing is often linked to claimed benefits of reduced hospitalisation of patients after community nursing involvement. However, the evidence for this effect is limited even where a narrower group of patients has been studied and where hospital admission avoidance is the key outcome. [26, 27]

While there is reported high levels of interest in the Buurtzorg model of district nursing in the UK and other countries outside of the Netherlands there is no literature evaluating its implementation that we were able to find. Other reported pilots in the UK are at early stages and have not published any findings. [17] A KPMG report of the Buurtzorg service in the Netherlands identified lower monthly costs per patient, shorter duration of care, higher hourly costs but overall lower median costs over the total episode of care than other home nursing services. [28] This early view evaluation was not able to address questions of cost for a number of reasons not least the evolving team, practice and administrative support. To address the cost and cost effectiveness questions in the English NHS setting would require scaling up the implementation of Buurtzorg in UK community health services and a longitudinal study with a large number of patients to give statistical confidence in the results. Investigation of impact on issues such as staff retention also requires longer periods than the early view.

Potential explanations for the positive reception lie within three interacting mechanisms: the organisational permission to re-focus on patient centred care, secondly the reduction of management and enabling operational decision making of the self-managing professionals and finally the smaller number of patients in relation to staffing numbers. These require further investigation over longer periods of time and with more than one team, preferably in multiple settings within the NHS.

Conclusion

The adapted Buurtzorg model of community nursing holds potential for addressing issues of concern to patients, carers and staff. From the patients' and carers' perspective these were issues in relation to lack of continuity in care provision, lack of support in attending to interacting multiple long terms conditions (physical, mental and social), and lack of proactive care navigation. From the nurses' and managers' perspective these were issues in relation to the quality of nursing care, low nurse job satisfaction and consequent unattractiveness of community nursing. The two interacting innovations, i.e. a renewed focus on patient and carer-centred care and the self-managing team, were implemented in ways that patients, carers, other health professionals and nurses could identify the difference it made to both the nursing care and also the nurses' working lives. It now requires longer term investigation to understand both the mechanism for change and also the sustainability.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS,

We would like to thank the many patients, health professionals and other NHS staff who gave their views and time in different ways for this evaluation. The team also acknowledges the input of Robert Grant statistician in the planning of the study and Katerina Belogianni who assisted with data management.

FOOTNOTES AND REQUIRED STATEMENTS

TWITTER

Follow Vari Drennan @varidrennan , Fiona Ross@ProfFionaross, Melania Calestani @melaniacale

COMPETING INTERESTS,

None declared

FUNDING

This independent evaluative study was funded by Health Education England (South London), a Non-Departmental Public Body under the provisions of the Care Act 2014 in collaboration with Guy’s & St. Thomas’s NHS Foundation Trust.

DISCLAIMER

The views expressed are those of the authors and not necessarily the views of Health Education England, Guy’s & St. Thomas’s NHS Foundation Trust, the NHS or the Department of Health.

ETHICS AND GOVERNANCE

The study met all NHS governance requirements, including participant consenting procedures, and permissions and was approved, including participant consenting procedures, by Kingston University Research Ethics Sub Committee for the Faculty of Health, Social Care & Education (reference FHSCE REC 12-16).

AUTHORS’ CONTRIBUTION

VMD was the principal investigator and with FR, MS, PW conceived, designed the study and was awarded the funding. VMD, MC, MS, FR contributed to the collection of data and all authors undertook analysis or interpretation of data for the work. VMD developed the first draft of the paper, and all the authors contributed to different sections and revised the paper critically for intellectual content. All authors gave final approval of the version to be published. Robert Grant provided statistical advice and Katriona Belogioanni assistance with data management.

DATA SHARING STATEMENT

None available

REFERENCES.

1. World Health Organisation. The World Health Report 2008 - Primary Health Care (Now More Than Ever). Geneva: World Health Organisation; URL www.who.int/whr/2008/en/ 2008. (Accessed December 2017)
2. Goodman, C., Ross, F., Mackenzie, A. and Vernon, S., 2003. A portrait of district nursing: its contribution to primary health care. *Journal of Interprofessional Care*, 17(1), pp.97-108.
3. Philibin, C.A.N., Griffiths, C., Byrne, G., Horan, P., Brady, A.M. and Begley, C., 2010. The role of the public health nurse in a changing society. *Journal of Advanced Nursing*, 66(4), pp.743-752.
4. Yamashita, M., Miyaji, F. and Akimoto, R., 2005. The public health nursing role in rural Japan. *Public health nursing*, 22(2), pp.156-165.
5. United Nations. Political declaration and Madrid International Plan of Action on Ageing. New York: United Nations; 2002.
6. Australian Government Institute of Health and Welfare. Nursing and Midwifery Workforce 2015 Data tables. <https://www.aihw.gov.au/reports/workforce/nursing-and-midwifery-workforce-2015/data> (Accessed December 2017)
7. NHS Digital. NHS Hospital & Community Health Service (HCHS) monthly workforce statistics July 2017, Provisional statistics. 2017. <https://digital.nhs.uk/catalogue/PUB30100> (Accessed December 2017)
8. Bureau of Labor Statistics. Occupational Employment and Wages, 29-1141 Registered Nurses. 2016. Washington, DC. <https://www.bls.gov/oes/current/oes291141.htm#st> (Accessed December 2017).
9. MacLean, L. Hassmiller, S. Shaffer, F. Rohrbaugh, K. Collier, T. Fairman J. Scale, causes, and implications of the primary care nursing shortage. *Annual Review of Public Health*, 35 (2014), pp. 443-457
10. Tourangeau, A.E., Patterson, E., Saari, M., Thomson, H. and Cranley, L., 2017. Work-related factors influencing home care nurse intent to remain employed. *Health Care Management Review*, 42(1), pp.87-97.
11. Guatun H, Olen H, Brat C. Home health care and nursing homes: the shortage of nurses in nursing homes and home care services. Oslo: Oslo and Akershus University College of Applied Sciences. 2016. <https://www.hioa.no/eng/About-HiOA/Centre-for-Welfare-and-Labour-Research/NOVA/Publikasjonar/Rapporter/2016/Home-health-care-and-nursing-homes-the-shortage-of-nurses-in-nursing-homes-and-home-care-services>. (Accessed January 2018)
12. Halter M Boiko O, Pelone F, Beighton C, Harris R, Gale J, Gourlay S, Drennan V. 2017 The determinants and consequences of adult nurse staff turnover: a systematic review of systematic reviews. *BMC Health Serv Res*. 2017 15:824. doi: 10.1186/s12913-017-2707-0
13. Buurtzorg. Welcome to Buurtzorg. Accessed December 2017 at <https://www.buurtzorg.com/>
14. Gray, B. H., Sarnak, D. O. & Burgers, J. S. (2015) Home Care by Self-governing Nursing Teams. The Commonwealth Fund. at : <http://www.commonwealthfund.org/publications/case-studies/2015/may/home-care-nursing-teams-netherlands> (Accessed December 2017)
15. De Blok J. Buurtzorg: humanity above bureaucracy in a Teal organization. Presentation at the Chief Nursing Office England Summit Meeting. 2015. <https://www.slideshare.net/NHSEEngland/cnu-summit-2015-buurtzorg-humanity-above-bureaucracy-in-a-teal-organization-jos-de-blok> (Accessed December 2017)

16. Maybin J, Charles A, Honeyman M. Understanding quality in district nursing services. London Kings Fund; at <https://www.kingsfund.org.uk/publications/quality-district-nursing> 2016. (Accessed December 2017)

17. Bowen M Buurtzorg could work in the UK, but why must it fit into the existing system? BMJ. 2017 Nov 24;359:j5376. doi: 10.1136/bmj.j5376.

18. Creswell, J.W. and Creswell, J.D., Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches. Thousand Oaks: Calif.; Sage Publications. 2017.

19. Donabedian A: The quality of care. How can it be assessed? JAMA 1988, 260:1743-1748.

20. Vermeer A and Wenting B. Self management: How does it work? Amsterdam: Reed Business: 2016.

21. Bartunek, J.M. and Murnighan, J.K., 1984. The nominal group technique: expanding the basic procedure and underlying assumptions. Group & Organization Studies, 9(3), pp.417-432.

22. Boyatzis RE., Transforming Qualitative Information: Thematic Analysis and Code Development. London, UK: Sage. 1998

23. David A. QUEST District Nursing Audit Assessment Tools . London . Unpublished. <http://www.questhealth.co.uk/> (Accessed December 2017)

24. Rodgers M, Thomas S, Harden M, Parker G, Street A, Eastwood A. Developing a methodological framework for organisational case studies: a rapid review and consensus development process. Health Serv Deliv Res 2016;4(1)

25. Martin KS The Omaha System: A Key to Practice, Documentation, and Information Management (2nd ed.). Omaha, NE: Health Connections Press. 2005

26. Shepperd S, Iliffe S, Doll HA, Clarke MJ, Kalra L, Wilson AD, Gonçalves-Bradley DC. Admission avoidance hospital at home. Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews 2016, Issue 9. Art. No.: CD007491. DOI: 10.1002/14651858.CD007491.pub2.

27. Gravelle H1, Dusheiko M, Sheaff R, Sargent P, Boaden R, Pickard S, Parker S, Roland M. Impact of case management (Evercare) on frail elderly patients: controlled before and after analysis of quantitative outcome data. BMJ. 2007 Jan 6;334(7583):31.

28. KPMG . 2015. The Added Value of Buurtzorg Relative to Other Providers of Home Care: A Quantitative Analysis of Home Care in the Netherlands in 2013 [in Dutch] / KPMG-Plexus. De toegevoegde waarde van Buurtzorg t.o.v. andere aanbieders van thuiszorg. Een kwantitatieve analyse van thuiszorg in Nederland anno 2013. 2015]

Research checklist / supplementary file

Checklist of Consensus standards for the reporting of organizational case studies [24 (Table 11)]

Reporting item	Page number on which item was reported	Page number of justification for not reporting
Describing the design		
1. Define the research as a case study	2	
2. State the broad aims of the study	2	
3. State the research question(s)/hypotheses	2	
4. Identify the specific case(s) and justify the selection	2	
Describing the data collection		
5. Describe how data were collected	3	
6. Describe the sources of evidence used	3	
7. Describe any ethical considerations and obtainment of relevant approvals, access and permissions	9	
Describing the data analysis		
8. Describe the analysis methods	3	
Interpreting the results		
9. Describe any inherent shortcomings in the design and analysis and how these might have influenced the findings	7	
10. Consider the appropriateness of methods used for the question and subject matter and why it was that qualitative methods were appropriate	7	
11. Discuss the data analysis	8	
12. Ensure that the assertions are sound, neither over- nor under-interpreting the data	7	
13. State any caveats about the study	8	

BMJ Open

TACKLING THE WORKFORCE CRISIS IN DISTRICT NURSING – CAN THE DUTCH BUURTZORG MODEL OFFER A SOLUTION AND A BETTER PATIENT EXPERIENCE? A MIXED METHODS CASE STUDY

Journal:	<i>BMJ Open</i>
Manuscript ID	bmjopen-2018-021931.R1
Article Type:	Research
Date Submitted by the Author:	12-Apr-2018
Complete List of Authors:	Drennan, Vari; Kingston University Faculty of Health Social Care and Education, Centre for Health & Social Care Research Calestani, Melania; Kingston University Faculty of Health Social Care and Education, Centre for Health & Social Care Research Ross CBE, Fiona; Kingston University and St. George's, University of London, Faculty of Health, Social Care and Education Saunders, Mary; Quest QUEST Community Health Care Consultancy, London, UK. West , Peter; Independent health economist
Primary Subject Heading:	Nursing
Secondary Subject Heading:	Health services research, Health policy
Keywords:	Organisation of health services < HEALTH SERVICES ADMINISTRATION & MANAGEMENT, Human resource management < HEALTH SERVICES ADMINISTRATION & MANAGEMENT, Quality in health care < HEALTH SERVICES ADMINISTRATION & MANAGEMENT, PRIMARY CARE

SCHOLARONE™
Manuscripts

**TACKLING THE WORKFORCE CRISIS IN DISTRICT NURSING – CAN THE
DUTCH BUURTZORG MODEL OFFER A SOLUTION AND A BETTER
PATIENT EXPERIENCE? A MIXED METHODS CASE STUDY**

Vari M Drennan, Centre for Health & Social Care Research, Joint Faculty of Kingston University & St. George’s University of London. London, UK. *

Melania Calestani, Centre for Health & Social Care Research , Joint Faculty of Kingston University & St. George’s University of London. London, UK.

Fiona Ross, Centre for Health and Social Care Research, Joint Faculty of Kingston University and St George’s, University of London, London, UK

Mary Saunders, QUEST Community Health Care Consultancy, London, UK.

Peter West, Independent health economist, London ,UK .

Corresponding Author
VM Drennan
v.drennan@sgul.kingston.ac.uk
Faculty for Health, Social Care & Education, Kingston University & St. George’s University of London, Hunter Wing ,St. George’s University of London,
Cranmer Terrace,
London SW170RE
Telephone 0208 725 2339

Word count 3,850 - excluding title page, references, figures

Key words

Home health nursing; District nursing; Nursing organisation and administration; Health service research

ABSTRACT

Despite policy intentions for more health care out of hospital, district nursing services face multiple funding and staffing challenges which compromise the care delivered and policy objectives.

Objectives: What is the impact of the adapted Buurtzorg model on feasibility, acceptability and effective outcomes in an English district nursing service?

Design: Mixed methods case study,

Setting: Primary care,

Participants: Neighbourhood nursing team (Buurtzorg model), patients and carers, general practitioners, other health professionals, managers and conventional district nurses.

Results: The adapted Buurtzorg model of community nursing demonstrated feasibility and acceptability to patients, carers, GPs and other health professionals. For many patients it was preferable to previous experiences of district nursing in terms of continuity in care, improved support of multiple long terms conditions (encompassing physical , mental and social factors), and proactive care. For the neighbourhood nurses the ability to make operational and clinical decisions at team level meant adopting practices which made the service more responsive, accessible, efficient, and offered a more attractive working environment. Challenges were reported by nurses and managers in relation to the recognition and support of the concept of self-managing teams within a large bureaucratic health care organisation. While there were some reports of clinical effectiveness and efficiency this was not possible to quantify, cost or compare with the standard district nursing service.

Conclusions: The adapted Buurtzorg model of neighbourhood nursing holds potential for addressing issues of concern to patients, carers and staff in the community. The two interacting innovations, i.e. a renewed focus on patient and carer-centred care and the self-managing team, were implemented in ways that patients, carers, other health professionals and nurses could identify difference for both the nursing care and also the nurses' working lives. It now requires longer term investigation to understand both the mechanism for change and also the sustainability.

Article Summary

Strengths and limitations of this study

1. Although a single site, the mixed methods (interviews, observation, analysis of patient records and internal reports and audits) provide multiple perspectives and add to the strength of the evidence.
2. The use of routinely collected patient level data was a limitation as it did not include measures of case-mix e.g. diagnosis, medical acuity or proximity to death or clinical outcomes.
3. We could not address questions of cost effectiveness for a number of reasons including that the new model was in the implementation stage and that as a complex intervention outcomes for district nursing are not clear cut.

;

BACKGROUND

Health care systems across the world are seeking to increase primary care services in order to address changing population health needs and contain rising health care costs. [1] In some countries this includes the provision of home visiting nurses who are named variously as home healthcare , visiting nurses, public health , community health and district nurses (as used in the United Kingdom, UK). Visiting nursing services serve mainly older adult patients with chronic conditions and disabilities who are housebound [2], although in some countries (see for example Ireland [3] and Japan [4]), they also provide maternal and child health services. The nursing care covers a spectrum of activities from education, teaching, technical care, physical and psychological support to case management which can address the management of acute illness, multiple long term conditions or palliative care. [2] Visiting nursing services therefore have the potential to help older people with chronic conditions remain in their own homes rather than be admitted to hospitals or care home facilities, which is a key element of the International Plan of Action on Ageing adopted by many nations. [5]

Visiting nurses are always a small group in any national nursing workforce (for example 7%, 9 and 13% in Australia, the UK and the United States respectively) [6, 7, 8] Attracting and retaining nurses in home visiting services is a recognised problem. [9, 10, 11] Many interacting factors affect nurse turnover but there is strong evidence that individual stress and autocratic managerial styles are influential in decisions to leave. [12] One model of visiting nursing services that it has been reported to both deliver high levels of patient satisfaction and also high staff satisfaction is that of the Dutch Buurtzorg organisation. [13] This social enterprise organisation uses a patient centred model of care combined with self-managing teams of visiting nurses. A central tenet has been ‘humanity over bureaucracy’ , i.e. giving authority and responsibility to the frontline nurses supported by small functional back office support without creating tiers of management and associated expensive overheads such as offices.[14] The patient centred model prioritises relationship based practice with continuity in nurse provider (in contrast to tasks split between different grades of staff or services) and is directed at empowering patients. [14] A review of the Dutch evidence and applicability to the United States reported “Buurtzorg has earned high patient and employee ratings and appears to provide high-quality home care at lower cost than other organizations” page 8. [15] The Buurtzorg model has attracted interest in many countries including the UK [16] where there are acknowledged problems in both meeting demand for these types of services and also in attracting and retaining nurses to work within them [17]. This paper reports on the evaluation of a pilot implementation of a Buurtzorg model of district nursing in a single, inner city site in the English National Health Service (NHS). This pilot within an NHS organisation in London was the first in the UK. [18] The NHS is a tax funded health care system, free at the point of delivery. The overarching research question was one of feasibility of such a model in district nursing in the English NHS setting. Supplementary research questions were concerned with the potential impact on nursing practice, patient and carer satisfaction and outcomes, about the organisational experience of implementation, as well as questions as to the types and availability of patient level data required to consider cost effectiveness.

METHODS

A mixed methods study was undertaken in a single case study. [19] This drew on the Donabedian framework for judging quality in health care i.e. criteria of acceptability, equity, effectiveness, appropriateness, and patient safety. [20]

The intervention of interest was the new team, known as the neighbourhood nursing (NN) team, who worked to the adapted Buurtzorg model i.e. still within a larger bureaucratic organisation. The first

three members of the team, with the coach, were recruited and started visiting patients in November 2016. The coach role was one of facilitation in self-management. The team visited patients who were registered with one of three general practices and lived within a twenty minute walk of their office in a socio-economically deprived area of Inner London. The team recruited new members throughout the first six months until they numbered nine at which point they split into two teams, one covering a new area. As a self-managing team they made all operational decisions in weekly meetings conducted using Buurtzorg principles, including voting. [21] Their employing NHS Trust had a district nursing service of around 200 nurses and health care assistant posts and at the time of the implementation a vacancy rate of 40%. The district nursing service was organised into teams each with a senior nurse. Each of these senior nurses reported to locality manager who in turn reported to another level in the organisation, which was only one of a number of divisions in the larger organisation.

Methods of data collection (from January 2017 – July 2017) included: semi structured individual interviews , group interviews, observation of nursing practice and team meetings, analysis of internal documents and anonymised patient records. Potential participants were approached in the first instance by the NHS Trust and details of those willing to take part were passed to the study team. Interviews (face to face or by telephone as preferred) were conducted with patients and carers (n=14, by MC) as well as general practitioners (GPs), other health professionals and managers (n=10 by FR). Topic guides were used that addressed questions of individual experience of the NN team, views on the way in which the new model was working , any contrasts observed with the standard district nursing services (comparative group) and any impact for patients, carers, or wider services. Interviews were digitally recorded or notes taken as preferred then transcribed verbatim and anonymized. Group interviews, using adapted nominal group techniques (NGT), [22] were conducted with the NN team on a monthly basis by VMD. A single group interview was also conducted with a locality district nursing (DN) team. NGT captures data contemporaneously on flip charts. The charts were transcribed and any identifiers removed. Analysis of transcripts was facilitated by NVivo 10 software. All interview materials were thematically analysed, based on the data-driven inductive approach [23], in an iterative and reflective process by three researchers (MC,FR,VMD). Disagreements were resolved through discussion with the wider team and amended accordingly. Observation of NN and DN team nursing practice was undertaken by an experienced observer of DN practice (MS). Observations were conducted over eight days of entire shifts with four NN and four DN team staff. Observations were recorded contemporaneously using validated tools for judging complexity and quality of patient care. [24] Six NN team meetings were observed and field notes taken. Anonymised patients electronic records of the NN team and a comparable number from DN team patients were requested with data fields to allow comparison of nursing activity and outcomes for patients with similar levels of complexity. Unfortunately, for reasons outlined in the discussion section of this paper, these were not available. Anonymised records of 100 NN team patients were given to the research team with specific data fields: age gender, reason for referral, nursing activities, times of contacts and discharge (not free text clinical notes). These were entered onto an SPSS database and descriptive analysis only conducted. Internal documents and reports were analysed for data pertinent to the questions of interest. Reporting in this paper uses standards for reporting organisational case study research (see supplementary file 1).[25]

Patient and public involvement

Patient and public involvement was through the funding body’s steering committee for the pilot rather than directly to the evaluation.

RESULTS

The multiple sources of data enable us to report findings from different perspectives: patients and carers; neighbourhood nurses (NN) and managers; other health professionals and from the observation of practice and patient records.

The patient and carer perspective

Patients and carers reported high levels of satisfaction with the NN team. *"The care the neighbourhood [nurses] giving is first class"* Patient 9. Patients commented on the willingness of the nurses to listen and address the needs of the patient.

"That's my kingpin [the nurse], because she's like you [the interviewer], she sits down and listens and she doesn't..., you start a sentence, she let me finish like you do". Patient 3

The proactive approach of the nurses of working on the problems the patients identified was positively commented on by many of those interviewed:

"They [the NN nurse] have come in and they have pushed the whole thing [the care required to support a patient with a stroke] into shape and knocked it into shape and got on with doing the things which we'd been waiting six or eight, 12 months for things to happen.... And they'll explain what they've done like 'I've phoned your GP'." Carer 10.

Eight patients had had previous experience with the district nursing service, *"I had them [district nurses] in the past and they were quite good as well"* Patient 5. However they were all able to point to negative experiences of the DN service resulting in poor clinical consequences. These were:

- A lack of continuity in nurses attending them and its impact on their care,
- Brief visits with a concomitant lack of attention to any problem beyond that the nurse had attended for,
- Lack of follow-up to initial visits or subsequent care,
- Difficulties in contacting the nurses.

All contrasted their NN team experience with that previous experience and described the difference now: continuity in the nurse which made addressing clinical issues more straightforward, attention paid to all their concerns and questions, follow up of visits and plans (with communication back as to what had been done or was going to happen) and direct contact details to the nurse (and NN team).

"And now we have the neighbourhood nurses ...the new system is so different, it's like cheese and chalk." Patient 7

Other health care professionals' perspective

Positive care outcomes were reported by General Practitioners (GPs) as well as positive feedback they had received from patients and family

"They've been especially good for the end-of-life patients ...and I think the family have found that good support generally, as well." GP 3

They described a period of learning to work together with the new team but noted some differences from the DN team in that the NN team came to them with patient problems and identified solutions rather than just problems. *"They do seem to be more proactive, I think, in care."* GP 1. Specialist

nurses reported positive patient clinical outcomes (for example improvement in long term condition management not previously achieved) which they attributed to the NN team way of working.

“They have made such a difference with some of the most difficult to engage people with mental health problems and other long term conditions”. Specialist nurse 3

Observing the care

Independent observation of the nursing practice confirmed that the NN team nursing practice was very different from the District Nurse (DN) team practices but it was also noted the NN team had a small patient caseload at that point in time in comparison to the DN team.

“It was clear to the observer that the NN team had a different approach to care. All nurses seemed to have a very personal relationship with their clients. They were often hugged and kissed by the client. Many clients gave unsolicited praise for their nurses citing how much they appreciated the continuity of care and the relationship they had with the nurse. Many patients were telephoned before the visit and often a time for the visit was negotiated. For almost every patient, each NN team nurse asked if they could get them anything to eat or drink and were quite happy to do this for the patients on some occasions. During the visit the NN nurses placed much more focus on the total care of the patients than most of visits observed of the DN nurses. They also spent time offering health promotion and preventative advice. For the patients seen with the NN nurses the communication with the social carers seemed to be fuller and more inclusive than that observed with the DN team for example explaining how best to help the patient to mobilise more.” Observer report

Inefficiencies in recording of care and duplication between home visiting nursing services were observed in the DN team. In contrast the NN team had changed their practices to be as efficient as possible and ensure continuity in nurses, avoiding duplication with other services.

Recorded care

Records of 100 patients referred to the NN team over 6 months were examined (97 following removal of duplicates). 74 had been referred by GPs but reasons were not given. 80 of these patients received care from the NN team (reasons for not receiving care included admission to hospital or hospice). The majority were female and aged over 75 (table 1). Comparative patient characteristics are provided for the wider DN service for 12 months covering the same period.

	NN team (%)	District nursing service (%)
Female	50 (62.5)	12884 (60)
Male	30 (37.5)	8531 (40)
Age Groups		
<25	0	99(<1)
25-34	0	195 (1)
35-44	1 (1.4)	417(3)
45-54	5 (7.0)	1132 (5)
55-64	14 (19.7)	2052(10)
65-74	15 (21.1)	3389 (16)
75-84	22 (31.0)	6416 (30)
85-94	14 (19.7)	6782 (32)
95-106	0	945 (4)

Table 1 Characteristics of the patients of the NN team and the DN service

The patient records did not use any classification system for patients' diagnosis, patient acuity or complexity of nursing activity. The NN team recorded 269 face to face appointments with patients and 2,267 telephone and follow up telephone consultations. In contrast, the DN teams rarely recorded using telephone consultations with patients (Table 2). Activities ranged from health promotion to palliative care. In contrast to the DN team, the NN team were providing personal care and meal preparation in the short term while Local Authority funded care packages were established (Table 2).

Activities	NN Team, of 2536 recorded contacts (%)	DN Team , of 303,510 recorded contacts (%)
Telephone and follow up telephone consultations	2,267 (89)	135 (0.04)
Meal preparation	62 (2)	57(0.02)
Personal care given	77(3)	120(0.03)

Table 2 NN and DN team types of contact

The nurses' experience

The NN team staff described their experience in very positive terms "*I enjoy every day – every day is a pleasure*", NN 1. They reported their satisfaction in their work came from positive patient feedback, from positive feedback from GPs and other health professionals and from working together collectively to provide the service.

"She [family carer] told me we had managed to do things for her [a relative] by [detail of nursing care and organising help from another service] that had really changed their lives and she felt so much better. That no one before we were involved had managed this". NN 3

The observed NN team meetings with their coach demonstrated the ways they worked as a team in making operational decisions. The NN team worked as just that – a team providing care for patients – which those who had worked in DN services were able to pinpoint the difference. They described their DN team experience had been that each staff member had their list of patients for the shift and

the responsibility was theirs alone. There had been no sense of collectively problem solving or helping each other to complete the necessary work in that shift. The NN team also paid attention to their work-life balance, for example, they were observed in team meetings to agree time back in lieu for extra hours worked. Many of the working practices the NN team adopted addressed the issues that the DN nursing staff raised in the NGT interview as aspects they disliked about their jobs (Table 3).

Frustration about their job expressed by the district nursing staff	The NN team way of working that addressed the frustration
Lack of time to complete the work –	The NN team agreed flexibility in their working hours to meet the patient need and a caseload they could manage,
Multiple , changing nursing staff providing care –	The NN team had model of a named staff member to patient,
Lack of communication about patients and their whereabouts e.g. attending hospital appointment.	Patients had named NN nurse telephone number and that nurse communicated directly with patients to arrange time for appointment visit
Lack of ability/permission to innovate	The decision making with the NN team allowed new ideas to be tried,
Lack of flexibility in the staff rota agreed at senior levels six weeks ahead–	NN team rota agreed in weekly meetings between the nurses and changes made as long as the staffing required was available,
Lack of extra pay or time in lieu for extra hours worked –	The NN team agreed time in lieu given to individuals for extra hours worked at their weekly meetings.

Table 3 Frustrations of DN team members as addressed by the NN team

The NN team members also reported their experience was very challenging in learning to work as a self-managing team. Some nurses applied for NN team jobs and then declined job offers following interview and others took up posts and subsequently left. The NN team described having to “*unlearn*” dependent behaviour on managers and also having to “*learn*” how to make and accept decisions as a team. This included learning how to manage differing opinions in a group and commit to the decisions of the team. It was evident in some observed team meetings that differences of opinion between team members were not always comfortable situations, that simple decision-making could be protracted and voting did not always resolve the situation. Some of the NN team questioned longer term issues about the nature of ‘flat’ structures with salaries fixed on their previous employment and as yet no clarity on career and financial progression.

Challenges were also reported in the extent the wider organisation recognised the concept of a self-managing team. “*I’m surprised after all these months that [managers in the wider organisation] are still trying to manage us, tell us what to do*”, NN 2. The NN team stressed how important a role the coach was in supporting them to be a self-managing team and also being a “*buffer*” between the team and the wider organisation. The NN team staff stressed that ‘*back office*’ support should be in place before a nursing team commenced. The lack of information technology systems to support mobile working (a current project in the wider organisation) was particularly irksome to the NN team especially when compared to that they had observed in the Dutch Buurtzorg service.

The managers’ perspective

There was strong commitment from the leaders and managers to testing and championing this model. At the same time there was curiosity and questioning as to the value and impact of an adapted Buurtzorg model. While the “*team and delivery*” was seen to be working well, all interviewees in different ways pointed out that “*the headaches are the organisation itself*”. Some interviewees

reflected on the readiness of the wider management cadre and administrative and support departments to embrace the concept of self-managing teams. The coach role was viewed as critical as was back office business support. The impact on costs was reported to be too early to assess. The ways to measure impact on costs were being discussed by managers. There were interesting suggestions “*need to be nuanced in how to evaluate costs...not just about costs also productivity*”. An example was given to illustrate this point, “*If a patient has been on the caseload for years with a twice a day visit that has been reduced to once a week because now [they are] self-managing, that is so much better*”. Other aspects were also discussed such as the rate of processing patient referrals “*massive opportunity to save on paper and time from streamlined decision-making*”, patient hospital readmission rates, the number of serious incidents and patient complaints as well as the friends and family test.

DISCUSSION

This study found that an adapted Buurtzorg model in the English NHS was feasible and acceptable to patients, carers, GPs and other health professionals, as well as preferable for many patients to current delivery models. The ability to make operational and clinical decisions at team level meant adopting practices which made the service more responsive, accessible, efficient, and for some nurses, attractive to work in. Challenges were reported in relation to the recognition and support of the concept of self-managing teams within a large bureaucratic health care organisation. While there were some reports of clinical effectiveness and efficiency this was not possible to quantify, cost or compare with the usual delivery of district nursing service.

The strength of this study was the use of mixed methods which allowed the research questions to be addressed from multiple perspectives and types of data. The study was limited to a single site and by using routinely collected patient level data. This data did not include diagnosis or measures of casemix to categorise both complexity in the patient (e.g. through multiple conditions) and also medical acuity or proximity to death. It should be noted that most NHS organisations do not routinely collect this type of data about district nursing patients. [17] The NHS use of block contracts for funding district nursing, rather than fee or tariff payment by type of patient or type of activity does little to promote such classification. This means there is no direct cost per patient to the NHS, as there is for hospital care, and so no clear, standardised costs to set beside any outcomes data. The Dutch Buurtzorg organisation uses the Omaha system of patient classification and nursing activity. [26] The Omaha system was developed in the United States as a structured classification and outcome measurement system. [26] The nature of community nursing care is relational and encompasses complex interventions, which are difficult to measure (compared to a single disease or single pill evaluation). Therefore the issue of cost effectiveness is not clear cut. Outcome measures are rarely quantified. Effectiveness of community nursing is often linked to claimed benefits of reduced hospitalisation of patients after community nursing involvement. However, the evidence for this effect is limited even where a narrower group of patients has been studied and where hospital admission avoidance is the key outcome. [27, 28]

While there is reported high levels of interest in the Buurtzorg model of district nursing in the UK and other countries such as the United States, Japan, China, Sweden outside of the Netherlands [13], there is no published or grey literature evaluating its implementation that we were able to find. The report of successful pilots in other countries, such as Japan, on the Dutch Buurtzorg website are not accompanied by details. [29] Other reported pilots in the UK are at early stages and have not published any findings. [18] A KPMG report of the Buurtzorg service in the Netherlands identified lower monthly costs per patient, shorter duration of care, higher hourly costs but overall lower median costs over the total episode of care than other home nursing services. [30] This early view evaluation

study was not able to address questions of cost for a number of reasons not least the evolving team, practice and administrative support. To address the cost and cost effectiveness questions in the English NHS setting would require scaling up the implementation of Buurtzorg in UK community health services and a longitudinal study with a large number of patients to give statistical confidence in the results. Investigation of impact on issues such as staff retention also requires longer periods than the early view.

Potential explanations for the positive reception lie within three interacting mechanisms: the organisational permission to re-focus on patient centred care, secondly the reduction of management and enabling operational decision making of the self-managing professionals and finally the smaller number of patients in relation to staffing numbers. These require further investigation over longer periods of time and with more than one team, preferably in multiple settings within the NHS.

Conclusion

The adapted Buurtzorg model of community nursing holds potential for addressing issues of concern to patients, carers and staff. From the patients' and carers' perspective these were issues in relation to lack of continuity in care provision , lack of support in attending to interacting multiple long terms conditions (physical , mental and social), and lack of proactive care navigation. From the nurses' and managers' perspective these were issues in relation to the quality of nursing care, low nurse job satisfaction and consequent unattractiveness of community nursing. The two interacting innovations, i.e. a renewed focus on patient and carer-centred care and the self-managing team, were implemented in ways that patients, carers, other health professionals and nurses could identify the difference it made to both the nursing care and also the nurses' working lives. It now requires longer term investigation to understand both the mechanism for change and also the sustainability.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS,

We would like to thank the many patients, health professionals and other NHS staff who gave their views and time in different ways for this evaluation. The team also acknowledges the input of Robert Grant statistician in the planning of the study and Katerina Belogianni who assisted with data management.

FOOTNOTES AND REQUIRED STATEMENTS

TWITTER

Follow Vari Drennan @varidrennan , Fiona Ross@ProfFionaross, Melania Calestani @melaniacale

COMPETING INTERESTS,

None declared

FUNDING

This independent evaluative study was funded by Health Education England (South London), a Non-Departmental Public Body under the provisions of the Care Act 2014 in collaboration with Guy's & St. Thomas's NHS Foundation Trust.

DISCLAIMER

The views expressed are those of the authors and not necessarily the views of Health Education England, Guy's & St. Thomas's NHS Foundation Trust, the NHS or the Department of Health.

ETHICS AND GOVERNANCE

The study met all NHS governance requirements, including participant consenting procedures, and permissions and was approved, including participant consenting procedures, by Kingston University Research Ethics Sub Committee for the Faculty of Health, Social Care & Education (reference FHSCE REC 12-16).

AUTHORS' CONTRIBUTION

VMD was the principal investigator and with FR, MS, PW conceived, designed the study and was awarded the funding. VMD, MC, MS, FR contributed to the collection of data and all authors undertook analysis or interpretation of data for the work. VMD developed the first draft of the paper, and all the authors contributed to different sections and revised the paper critically for intellectual content. All authors gave final approval of the version to be published. Robert Grant provided statistical advice and Katriona Belogioanni assistance with data management.

DATA SHARING STATEMENT

None available

REFERENCES.

1. World Health Organisation. The World Health Report 2008 - Primary Health Care (Now More Than Ever). Geneva: World Health Organisation; URL www.who.int/whr/2008/en/ 2008. (Accessed December 2017).

2. Goodman C, Ross F, Mackenzie A. et al. A portrait of district nursing: its contribution to primary health care. *Journal of Interprofessional Care*, 2003;17:97-108.

3. Philibin C, Griffiths C, Byrne G, et al. The role of the public health nurse in a changing society. *Journal of Advanced Nursing*. 2010;66:743-752.

4. Yamashita M, Miyaji F, Akimoto R. The public health nursing role in rural Japan. *Public Health Nursing*. 2005;22:156-165.

5. United Nations. Political declaration and Madrid International Plan of Action on Ageing. New York: United Nations; 2002.

6. Australian Government Institute of Health and Welfare. Nursing and Midwifery Workforce 2015 Data tables. URL <https://www.aihw.gov.au/reports/workforce/nursing-and-midwifery-workforce-2015/data>. 2016. (Accessed December 2017).

7. NHS Digital. NHS Hospital & Community Health Service (HCHS) monthly workforce statistics July 2017, Provisional statistics. 2017. URL <https://digital.nhs.uk/catalogue/PUB30100> (Accessed December 2017).

8. Bureau of Labor Statistics. Occupational Employment and Wages, 29-1141 Registered Nurses. Washington, DC: Bureau of Labour Statistics. 2016/ URL <https://www.bls.gov/oes/current/oes291141.htm#st> (Accessed December 2017).

9. MacLean L, Hassmiller S, Shaffer F, et al. Scale, causes, and implications of the primary care nursing shortage. *Annual Review of Public Health*. 2014;35: 443-457.

10. Tourangeau AE, Patterson E, Saari, M. et al. Work-related factors influencing home care nurse intent to remain employed. *Health Care Management Review*. 2017;42:87-97.

11. Guatun H, Olen H, Brat C. Home health care and nursing homes: the shortage of nurses in nursing homes and home care services. Oslo: Oslo and Akershus University College of Applied Sciences. 2016. URL <https://www.hioa.no/eng/About-HiOA/Centre-for-Welfare-and-Labour-Research/NOVA/Publikasjonar/Rapporter/2016/Home-health-care-and-nursing-homes-the-shortage-of-nurses-in-nursing-homes-and-home-care-services>. (Accessed January 2018).

12. Halter M, Boiko O, Pelone F. et al. The determinants and consequences of adult nurse staff turnover: a systematic review of systematic reviews. *BMC Health Serv Res*. 2017 15:824. doi: 10.1186/s12913-017-2707-0.

13. Buurtzorg. Welcome to Buurtzorg. URL (<https://www.buurtzorg.com/>) Accessed December 2017).

14. Kreitzer M J, Monsen K A, Nandram S.etal.. Buurtzorg Nederland: A global model of social innovation, change and whole systems healing. *Global Advances in Health and Medicine*. 2015;4:40-44.

15. Gray B H, Sarnak D O, Burgers JS. Home Care by Self-governing Nursing Teams. The Commonwealth Fund. 2015. URL <http://www.commonwealthfund.org/publications/case-studies/2015/may/home-care-nursing-teams-netherlands> (Accessed December 2017).

16. De Blok J. Buurtzorg: humanity above bureaucracy in a Teal organization. Presentation at the Chief Nursing Office England Summit Meeting .2015. URL <https://www.slideshare.net/NHSEngland/cnu-summit-2015-buurtzorg-humanity-above-bureaucracy-in-a-teal-organization-jos-de-blok> (Accessed December 2017).

17. Maybin J, Charles A, Honeyman M. Understanding quality in district nursing services. London: Kings Fund. 2016. URL <https://www.kingsfund.org.uk/publications/quality-district-nursing>. (Accessed December 2017).

18. Bowen M. Buurtzorg could work in the UK, but why must it fit into the existing system? *BMJ*. 2017;359:j5376. doi: 10.1136/bmj.j5376.
19. Creswell JW, Creswell JD. Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approach. Thousand Oaks: Calif.; Sage Publications. 2017.
20. Donabedian A: The quality of care. How can it be assessed? *JAMA* 1988, 260:1743-1748.
21. Vermeer A and Wenting B. Self-management: How does it work? Amsterdam: Reed Business: 2016.
22. Bartunek JM, Murnighan JK. The nominal group technique: expanding the basic procedure and underlying assumptions. *Group & Organization Studies*.1984; 9:417-432.
23. Boyatzis RE. Transforming Qualitative Information: Thematic Analysis and Code Development. London, UK: Sage.1998
24. David A. QUEST District Nursing Audit Assessment Tools . London . Unpublished. <http://www.questhealth.co.uk/> (Accessed December 2017)
25. Rodgers M, Thomas S, Harden M, et al. Developing a methodological framework for organisational case studies: a rapid review and consensus development process. *Health Serv Deliv Res* 2016;4(1)
26. Martin KS The Omaha System: A Key to Practice, Documentation, and Information Management (2nd ed.). Omaha, NE: Health Connections Press. 2005
27. Shepperd S, Iliffe S, Doll HA. Et al. Admission avoidance hospital at home. Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews 2016, Issue 9. Art. No.: CD007491. DOI: 10.1002/14651858.CD007491.pub2.
28. Gravelle H1, Dusheiko M, Sheaff R. et al. Impact of case management (Evercare) on frail elderly patients: controlled before and after analysis of quantitative outcome data. *BMJ*. 2007;334:31.
29. Buurtzorg International. Buurtzorg Neighbourhood Care in Asia. 2018. at URL <https://www.buurtzorg.com/buurtzorg-neighborhood-care-asia/> (Accessed April 2018)
30. KPMG . The Added Value of Buurtzorg Relative to Other Providers of Home Care: A Quantitative Analysis of Home Care in the Netherlands in 2013 .2015. [in Dutch] / KPMG-Plexus. De toegevoegde waarde van Buurtzorg t.o.v. andere aanbieders van thuiszorg. Een kwantitatieve analyse van thuiszorg in Nederland anno 2013]. (Accessed October 2017)]

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Research checklist / supplementary file

Checklist of Consensus standards for the reporting of organizational case studies [25
Table 11)]

Reporting item	Page number on which item was reported	Page number of justification for not reporting
Describing the design		
1. Define the research as a case study	2	
2. State the broad aims of the study	2	
3. State the research question(s)/hypotheses	2	
4. Identify the specific case(s) and justify the selection	2	
Describing the data collection		
5. Describe how data were collected	3	
6. Describe the sources of evidence used	3	
7. Describe any ethical considerations and obtainment of relevant approvals, access and permissions	9	
Describing the data analysis		
8. Describe the analysis methods	3	
Interpreting the results		
9. Describe any inherent shortcomings in the design and analysis and how these might have influenced the findings	7	
10. Consider the appropriateness of methods used for the question and subject matter and why it was that qualitative methods were appropriate	7	
11. Discuss the data analysis	8	
12. Ensure that the assertions are sound, neither over-nor under-interpreting the data	7	
13. State any caveats about the study	8	